

MEETING OF
MONDAY, JANUARY 6, 1992

On a motion by Hartley, second by Filner and a unanimous vote, the Agency agenda was trailed to Tuesday, January 7, 1992 at 10:00 am. in the 12th floor Council Chambers.

At 10:59 a.m. on Tuesday, January 7, 1992 the meeting was called to order.

Item 1: Roll Call

Present: Members Wolfsheimer, Hartley, Stevens, Behr, Stallings,
McCarty, Filner and Vice Chair Roberts
Excused: Chair O'Connor
Secretary: Charles G. Abdelnour

Item 2: Adoption of a resolution directing the Executive Director to:

- a) establish policies and procedures and recommend nominees for a Community Redevelopment Commission;
- b) establish a separate Redevelopment Agency staff to implement non-CCDC and SEDC redevelopment project areas, including appropriate policies and procedures;
- c) develop a policy regarding Project Area Committees (PACs);
- d) establish a long-term fiscal strategy for the on-going administration of the Agency and implementation of its projects; and
- e) declaring the Agency's intent to form and/or sanction no new corporations for the implementation of redevelopment projects.

(Continued from meetings of October 22, October 29, and December 9, 1991 and January 6, 1992)

Deputy Executive Director Maureen Stapleton gave the staff report, noting that at past meetings Agency Members had expressed opposition to the establishment of a Community Redevelopment Commission, and favored instead Alternative 1 on page 8 of Report No. 92.02/RA which would allow community advisory groups, supported by separate Agency staff, to report directly to the Agency. Staff believes that either of the two proposals will lead to the most efficient implementation structure and will reduce administrative costs. Either proposal is a workable structure for the Agency. Both the City's Subcommittee on Small Business and Revitalization and the Economic Development Task Force have recommended that the Agency Members designate a separate redevelopment agency staff and not create any additional area or project-specific redevelopment corporations.

The Vice Chair opened the Public Hearing. Speaking in favor of staff's recommendations were John Cheney, citing staff's expertise and understanding of the Brown Act, the Commission's direct accountability to the Agency, and more effective use of tax dollars. Adrian Marine

Item 2: (continued)

expressed opposition to any formal redevelopment, but did support recommendations A, B, D and E with some modifications. Karen Manley spoke on the lack of confidence that many City Heights residents have in the leadership of the Community Development Corporation (CDC) and PAC, noting that although the original PAC was elected by a community-wide election, vacancies are now filled by votes of just the PAC members. She further feels there is a bias among some PAC members toward certain special-interest projects.

Also in favor of staff recommendations were Mark Jolles, who feels misled by the CDC and Visions Project supporters, asking the Agency to please not give these special-interest groups control over redevelopment in City Heights; and Martha Murphy, representing a neighborhood awareness group. She feels interests of the minorities of City Heights would be better served by retaining redevelopment activities with City staff. Ms. Murphy summarized a letter from Julie Sexauer which also supported her views, and submitted it for the record.

Lincoln Pickard, of Otay Mesa, spoke on the sensitivity of eminent domain matters, supporting election of CDC members so that community members have more control over what is happening in their community.

Those opposed to the proposed actions then spoke. Jim Bliesner represented a committee of five people, including himself and four City Heights PAC members. He stated that this committee was appointed by the Council three months ago to study structural options for redevelopment in City Heights. It was that committee's conclusion that the best way to implement redevelopment in City Heights was by establishing a development corporation similar to CCDC and SEDC. The committee believed there is a historical precedence for establishing independent corporations; it is cost effective to implement activities through independent corporations; productivity is enhanced with a focused staff; an independent agency is more accountable; and special circumstances in City Heights due to its size and population require a localized approach, particularly in matters of eminent domain.

John Stump, a member of the above committee, further supported Mr. Bliesner's comments. Also speaking in opposition was Jim Merriken, president of the City Heights Business Improvement Association.

Member Hartley asked Ms. Stapleton to report to the Rules Committee on criteria for election of CDC members and PAC members to insure a diverse representation from the community, as well as conformance to Brown Act requirements regarding open meetings.

Member Stallings assured community members that only the board members of the development corporation would be appointed by Council. The board would then select the staff of the development corporation. Member Stevens emphasized his belief that the corporations should show a profit and become financially independent.

Item 2: (continued)

Member McCarty expressed concerns regarding establishment of another development corporation, and problems with existing CDCs and Business Improvement Districts (BIDs).

Hal Valderhaug, of the City Attorney's office, discussed financing needs for establishment of a development corporation.

Motion by Hartley to adopt an amended resolution, deleting formation of a Redevelopment Commission and adopting instead Alternative 1, with the addition of the establishment of a development corporation in City Heights which will have diverse representation; and adopting all other recommendations.

Second by Stevens.

Vote: 7-1 (McCarty voting nay)

ADOPTED AS RESOLUTION NO. 2039

Public Comment - none.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:09 p.m.


Secretary of the Redevelopment Agency
of the City of San Diego, California